

Remarks

1. Summary of the Office Action

In the Office Action mailed February 27, 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4-6, 9, 22-23, and 28-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of U.S. Patent No. 6,836,644 (Bacon et al.), U.S. Patent No. 6,088,589 (Valentine et al.), and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0073438 (Fukushima et al.).

2. Amendments and Pending Claims

Applicant has amended claim 22. Claims 1, 4-6, 9, 22-23, and 28-37 are presently pending in this application. Claims 1 and 22 are independent.

3. Payment of Fees

A fee of \$180.00 is required for submission of an Information Disclosure Statement. The Patent Office is hereby authorized to charge the \$180.00 fee and any additional fee(s) required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17 to Deposit Account No. 210765.

4. Response to the Claim Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4-6, 9, 22-23, and 28-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Bacon et al., Valentine et al., and Fukushima et al. According to M.P.E.P §2143, in order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of a claimed invention by applying a combination of references, the combination must disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations. Applicant has amended independent claim 22. Independent claims 1 and 22 clearly distinguish over the combination of Bacon et al., Valentine et al., and Fukushima et al. because the combination of Bacon et al., Valentine et al., and Fukushima et al. fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations of either of these claims.

In particular, the combination of Bacon et al., Valentine et al., and Fukushima et al. fails to disclose or suggest (i) responsively activating an alert at the fixed wireless device if the registered location of the fixed wireless device does not match the current location of the fixed wireless device, as recited in claim 1, and (ii) alert logic arranged to invoke the alert mechanism so as to provide an alert at the wireless local loop hub in response to the determination that the current location of the wireless local loop hub does not match the registered location of the wireless local loop hub, as recited in claim 22.

At best, the combination of Bacon et al., Valentine et al., and Fukushima et al. teaches: (i) a fixed wireless device that includes a comparator and a converter, the comparator receives an initial location previously stored in memory and compares a current location to the previously stored location to determine whether the fixed wireless device remains in the initial location, and then *provides the result to the converter where a telephone call can be terminated or prevented* if the fixed wireless device is not in the initial and intended location, and (ii) a mobile station that is configured to alert its user of the fact that the *mobile station* is located outside the coverage area of a *terrestrially-based mobile telecommunications system*. (See, e.g., Bacon et al., col. 5, lines 5-27, and Figure 2; Valentine et al., col. 9, lines 9-12).

Applicant submits, however, that this portion of the combination of Bacon et al., Valentine et al., and Fukushima et al. does not teach or suggest (i) responsively activating an alert at the fixed wireless device if the registered location of the fixed wireless device does not match the current location of the fixed wireless device, and (ii) alert logic arranged to invoke the alert mechanism so as to provide an alert at the wireless local loop hub in response to the determination that the current location of the wireless local loop hub does not match the registered location of the wireless local loop hub, for at least the reasons that merely providing a

comparison result to a converter where a telephone call can be terminated or prevented does not amount to activating an alert or invoking an alert mechanism to provide an alert, and alerting a mobile station user that the *mobile station* is located outside the coverage area of a *terrestrially-based mobile telecommunications system* does not amount to activating an alert at a fixed wireless device if the registered location of the *fixed wireless device* does not match the current location of the *fixed wireless device*.

In rejecting claims 1 and 22, the Examiner acknowledged that Bacon et al. is silent on responsively activating an alert at the fixed wireless device if the registered location does not match the current location of the fixed wireless device. However, the Examiner indicated that Valentine et al. teaches that it is well known in the art to responsively activate an alert at a wireless device if the registered location of the wireless device does not match the current location of the wireless device. The Examiner cited to Valentine et al., col. 9, lines 6-18.

At best, this portion of Valentine et al. teaches a mobile station 120 is configured to alert its user of the fact that *the mobile station 120 is located outside the coverage area of a terrestrially-based mobile telecommunications system*. Applicant believes that this portion of Valentine et al. suggests that prior to alerting the user of the fact that the mobile station is located outside the coverage area of the terrestrially-based mobile telecommunications system, the present location of the mobile station is compared with the coverage area of the terrestrially-based mobile telecommunications system or with an area outside the coverage area of the terrestrially-based mobile telecommunications system. In this regard, Valentine et al. suggests alerting a mobile station user (that the mobile station 120 is located outside the coverage area) after a comparison is made between information for two distinct entities, namely location

information for a first entity (i.e., the mobile station) and coverage area information for a second entity (i.e., the terrestrially-based mobile telecommunications system).

However, even if it is assumed that the mobile station 120 of Valentine et al. teaches or suggests the claimed fixed wireless device or wireless local loop hub, which Applicant does not concede, Applicant submits that Valentine et al., alone or in combination with Bacon et al. and Fukushima et al., does not teach or suggest (i) responsively activating an alert at the fixed wireless device if the registered location of the fixed wireless device does not match the current location of the fixed wireless device, and (ii) alert logic arranged to invoke the alert mechanism so as to provide an alert at the wireless local loop hub in response to the determination that the current location of the wireless local loop hub does not match the registered location of the wireless local loop hub, for at least the reason that providing an alert after comparing information for two distinct entities, namely the mobile station 120 and the terrestrially-based mobile telecommunications system does not teach or suggest activating an alert or invoking an alert mechanism to provide an alert if the registered location and the current location of the same entity (e.g., the fixed wireless device or the wireless local loop hub) does not match.

Since the combination of Bacon et al., Valentine et al., and Fukushima et al. fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations of claims 1 and 22, Applicant submits that claims 1 and 22 are allowable. Additionally, without conceding the assertions made by the Examiner regarding dependent claims 4-6, 9, 23, and 28-37, Applicant submits that dependent claims 4-6, 9, 23, and 28-37 are allowable for at least the reason that they depend from one of allowable claims 1 or 22.

5. Conclusion

Applicant believes that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this response. However, failure to address a specific rejection or assertion made by the Examiner does not signify that Applicant agrees with or concedes that rejection or assertion.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that claims 1, 4-6, 9, 22-23, and 28-37 are in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,

**MCDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP**

Date: May 27, 2007

By: /David L. Ciesielski/
David L. Ciesielski
Reg. No. 57,432